

THE VERSIONS  
OF THE *VITA NICONIS*

DENIS F. SULLIVAN

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE *Vita Nikonis* (BHG<sup>3</sup>, 1366, 1367) has been characterized as "eine der wichtigsten Quellen für die innere Geschichte Griechenlands im 10. Jahrhundert."<sup>1</sup> St. Nikon *Metanoieite* was born in the Pontus Polemoniacus *ca.* 930. At some point in the 950's he began preaching his message of repentance in Asia Minor. When Nicephorus Phocas recaptured Crete from the Arabs in the spring of 961, Nikon journeyed there and spent the next seven years re-Christianizing the island.<sup>2</sup> After brief periods in Athens, Euboea, Thebes, and other cities and villages of Hellas and the Peloponnese, he came to Lacedaemonia, probably in the early 970's,<sup>3</sup> where he remained until his death toward the end of the century. His *Vita* recounts numerous details of his activities during these periods and also provides a variety of insights into social customs and monastic practices as well as *obiter dicta* on historical events of the time.

The *Vita Nikonis* is preserved in two manuscripts, Barberini gr. 583 and Koutloumoussi 210. The Barberini text has never been edited, although a Latin translation (at times only a paraphrase) was made directly from the manuscript by Jacques Sirmond *ca.* 1600. The Koutloumoussi text was edited by Spyridon Lampros in 1906. There are considerable differences between these two texts, but as yet their relationship has not been established. In the following remarks, which derive from a projected edition and translation of the *Vita*, I would like to address this issue. I believe that new external evidence on the anonymous author's method of composition, as well as a comparison of some of the significant variations between the texts, shows that the Barberini manuscript contains the earlier form of the *Vita*.

## II. THE MANUSCRIPTS

The *Vita Nikonis* was first known in printed form in the Latin translation of Jacques Sirmond, who worked in Rome from 1590 to 1608, collaborating with Cardinal Baronius on the *Annales Ecclesiastici*.<sup>4</sup> His translation was published in excerpts by Baronius, who remarks that Sirmond worked from materials *ex Sfortiana bibliotheca*.<sup>5</sup> This Sforza manuscript used by Sirmond

<sup>1</sup> H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 577.

<sup>2</sup> See E. Voulgarakis, "Nikon Metanoieite und die Rechristianisierung der Kreter vom Islam," *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*, 47 (1963), 192-204, 258-69.

<sup>3</sup> On the dating, see R. J. H. Jenkins and C. Mango, "A Synodicon of Antioch and Lacedaemonia," *DOP*, 15 (1961), 238.

<sup>4</sup> C. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici, a Christo Nato ad Annum 1198*, 12 vols. (Rome, 1580-1607). I have used the edition published by L. Guerin, 37 vols. (Barri-Ducis, 1864-83).

<sup>5</sup> Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, XVI, 114. The complete translation was published by E. Martene and U. Durand, *Veterum Scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, VI, (Paris, 1729), 837-87.

can be identified with that now in the Barberini collection of the Vatican Library, Barberini gr. 583 (formerly VI,22).<sup>6</sup> Pages 611–83 contain a *Vita Niconis* which corresponds closely with the Latin translation of Sirmond, and Delehaye has shown that this must be the manuscript from the Sforza library.<sup>7</sup> Barberini gr. 583 (hereafter B) is a large paper codex, .38 × .28 m., written in two columns and consisting of 1026 pages. It is a collection of saints' lives and homilies, copied by various hands generally attributed on palaeographical grounds to the fifteenth century.<sup>8</sup> The provenance of the manuscript prior to its use by Sirmond is unknown.

Another text of the *Vita Niconis* was found in 1880 in Koutlounousi cod. 210, folios 106a–181b, by Spyridon Lampros. He published a Greek edition in 1906 based solely on this manuscript.<sup>9</sup> Koutlounousi 210 (hereafter K) is a paper codex written in single columns and consisting of 181 folios.<sup>10</sup> The scribe and date of the codex are known precisely from a note at the end of the manuscript: Ἐτελειώθη τὸ παρὸν διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ τοῦ ταπεινοῦ Παρθενίου ἐπισκόπου κατὰ τὸ ,αχλ' ἔτος τὸ σωτήριον (= 1630). This Parthenius has been identified as the bishop of Bresthene<sup>11</sup> who is known from other sources.

The *Vita Niconis*, then, is contained in these two manuscripts. The Greek text has been edited *in toto* only from the Koutlounousi codex, although Lampros later published a brief discussion of Barberini gr. 583, noting some of the differences between B and K.<sup>12</sup> Galanopoulos reprinted Lampros' text of K in 1933, adding some readings derived from the Barberini manuscript.<sup>13</sup> Neither editor, however, attempted to establish the relationship between the two texts, and each was quite selective in his use of B.

A comparison of B and K quickly reveals that, although the two texts have many passages in common, there are a number of important discrepancies. In some cases these can be attributed to a scribal error, e.g., small omissions or slight changes. Others, however, are more interesting. They might be characterized as: (1) lengthy sections which are similar, but show substantial rewording in both grammar and vocabulary; (2) large sections which appear in B, but are absent in K; and (3) passages of some length which are completely different. None of these can be explained by the

<sup>6</sup> For a description and inventory of the manuscript, see H. Delehaye, "Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Barberinianae de Urbe," *AnalBoll*, 19 (1900), 107–14.

<sup>7</sup> *Idem*, "La Vie d'Athanase, Patriarche de Constantinople (1289–1293, 1304–1310)," *MélRome*, 17 (1897), 40 note 1.

<sup>8</sup> See *idem*, "Catalogus," 107. N. Veas, "Vie de Saint Théoclète, Evêque de Lacédémone," *Vizantijskoe Obozrenie*, 2 (1916), Suppl. I, p. 4, notes the common ascription to the fifteenth century but suggests that the portion of the manuscript containing the *Vita Niconis* may be fourteenth-century.

<sup>9</sup> Ὁ βίος Νίκωνος τοῦ Μετανοεῖτε, ed. S. Lampros, in *Νέος Ἑλλ.*, 3 (1906), 132–228.

<sup>10</sup> For a description and inventory of the manuscript, see S. Lampros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, I (Cambridge, 1895), 297.

<sup>11</sup> See M. Galanopoulos, Ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος βιβλιογράφος ἐπίσκοπος Βρεσθένης Παρθένιος, in Ἐπ. Ἐτ. Βυλ. Σπ., 12 (1936), 259–60.

<sup>12</sup> S. Lampros, Ὁ Βαρβερινὸς κώδιξ τοῦ βίου τοῦ Νίκωνος, in *Νέος Ἑλλ.*, 5 (1908), 301–48.

<sup>13</sup> M. Galanopoulos, Βίος, πολιτεία, εἰκονογραφία, θαύματα καὶ ἀσματικὴ ἀκολουθία τοῦ ὁσίου καὶ θεοφύρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Νίκωνος τοῦ Μετανοεῖτε (Athens, 1933).

mechanics of transmission.<sup>14</sup> Rather, they suggest that one of the texts must be a rewriting of the other. The problem is to establish which is the earlier version.

### III. THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

One solution to this problem lies, I believe, in the relationship of the *Vita Niconis* to earlier hagiographic and patristic literature, especially the *Vita Lucae Junioris* (BHG<sup>3</sup>, 994). The *Life of Saint Luke* (890–953) was written by a younger contemporary of that saint shortly after Luke's death and may thus be attributed to the third quarter of the tenth century.<sup>15</sup> It must, therefore, precede the *Life of St. Nikon*, who did not die until late in the tenth century. A comparison of these two *Lives* suggests very strongly that the author of the *Vita Niconis* knew the *Vita Lucae* quite well and used portions of it in composing his own work.<sup>16</sup> The *Vita Lucae* opens with a prologue in which the choice of Luke as a subject is justified. It continues with a description of Luke's childhood, adult life, and death, and concludes with a series of posthumous miracles and an epilogue. The *Vita Niconis* follows the same format, which in itself is hardly startling. Yet certain similarities of thought and wording in each of these sections are so striking as to put a definite connection almost beyond doubt. In the following pages I shall illustrate this relationship by a comparison of various passages from the two *Lives*, using the edition of the *Vita Lucae* by P. Kremos<sup>17</sup> and the Barberini version of the *Vita Niconis*.<sup>18</sup> The similar passages will be presented in parallel columns with brief introductions to set the context. Where K differs from the passages of B cited below, I will give the variants. Where no variant is noted, B and K are in agreement. In order to clarify the argument, however, I will reserve discussion of these variants until after I have completed the comparison of the Barberini text to the *Vita Lucae*.

<sup>14</sup> I do not, in this paper, consider the stemmatic relationship of the two manuscripts, but rather the relationship between the two versions they contain. And of course the fact of revision complicates any attempt to arrive at a stemma. A careful examination of the areas in which there does not appear to be any revision, however, suggests that each manuscript is a witness of independent value for these sections.

<sup>15</sup> On the dating, see G. Da Costa-Louillet, "Saints de Grèce aux VIII<sup>e</sup>, IX<sup>e</sup>, et X<sup>e</sup> siècles," *Byzantion*, 32 (1961), 331–32.

<sup>16</sup> Certain connections between the two saints apparently existed prior to the composition of the *Vita Niconis*. Nikon himself had visited Thebes ca. 970, before he went to Lacedaemonia. More significant still, when Hosios Lukas was constructed, a mosaic of Nikon was included in the catholicon (M. Chatzidakis, "A propos de la date et du fondateur de Saint Luc," *CahArch*, 20 [1969], 127–50 has proposed a date of 1011; E. Stikas, "Nouvelles observations sur la date de construction du catholicon et de l'église de la Vierge du monastère de saint Luc en Phocide," *Corsi Rav*, 1972, pp. 311–30, opposes Chatzidakis and argues that the catholicon dates from the time of Constantine IX Monomachos, probably 1042–45). O. Demus, *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration* (London, 1947), 57, comments on the inclusion of this mosaic in relation to the "monastic and local provincial character" of the church.

<sup>17</sup> Ed. P. Kremos, in *Φωκικά*, I (Athens, 1884), 25–62.

<sup>18</sup> I have used a microfilm of the Barberini manuscript.

*Vita Lucae*

The prologue of the *Life of Luke* begins:

Οὐ χρόνος ἦν ἀληθῶς ὁ τοῦ καλοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν σπουδῆς αἴτιος, ἀλλὰ γνώμη μόνη καὶ ἡ τὰ χρηστὰ φιλοῦσα προαίρεσις.<sup>19</sup>

The author continues by remarking that this can be seen from other men who . . . βίον ἄληπτον τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐπιδειξαμένων. . . .<sup>21</sup>

Luke, however, the subject of his biography, has . . . τὸ τραχὺ καὶ ἀνώμαλον τῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν φερούσης καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἄβατον οὐ τῇ φύσει ταύτης ἔδειξε περιόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ γνώμῃ μᾶλλον καὶ προαιρέσει τῶν τὰ καλὰ μέν, ἐπίπωνα δὲ διὰ ψυχῆς ἀσθένειαν καὶ μαλακίαν παραιτουμένων.<sup>23</sup>

In the prologues of these two *Lives*, then, one can see four passages in which the thought and the wording are quite close. A contrast of χρόνος with γνώμη and προαίρεσις opens the *Vita Lucae*. A similar juxtaposition occurs in the *Vita Nikonis* (B), with the addition of τόπος to complement χρόνος. The similarity increases with the reference to those who have “displayed a life not attainable by the majority,” and this close verbal resemblance continues in the contrast of φύσις and γνώμη, and in the passage on the “weakness and softness of the soul.” In these final three examples almost direct quotations are used, while in the first the author of the *Life of Nikon* seems to have elaborated on and expanded the contrast found in the *Vita Lucae*. One might also note that the phrase ἡ τὰ χρηστὰ φιλοῦσα προαίρεσις, which occurs in the opening passage of the earlier *vita*, is represented only by προαίρεσις in the opening of the *Vita Nikonis* but is picked up in full later in the prologue.

*Vita Nikonis*

The prologue of the *Vita Nikonis* begins:

Εἰ οὐ τόπῳ ἢ χρόνῳ, γνώμῃ δὲ μᾶλλον στερρᾷ καὶ προαιρέσει τὰ τε μέγιστα τῶν κατορθωμάτων καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ ἀκρότατον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπίδοσιν δεῖ ἐπιγράφειν. . . .<sup>20</sup> (Εἰ . . . ἐπιγράφειν deest in K).

Later the author speaks of the glory of those . . . βίον ἄληπτον τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐπιδειζάμενοι. . . (βίον . . . ἐπιδειζάμενοι deest in K).<sup>22</sup>

Finally it is said that Nikon . . . τὸ τραχὺ καὶ ἀναντες τῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀγούσης, τοῖς δὲ πλείουσι (Κ πλείοσι) καὶ ἄβατον, οὐ τὸ τῇ φύσει (Κ οὕτω τὴν φύσιν) ταύτης ἔδειξε περιόν (Κ περιών). . . ἀλλὰ τῇ γνώμῃ μᾶλλον καὶ τῇ τὰ χρηστὰ φιλοῦσῃ προαιρέσει. . . , and that Nikon was an example to τοῖς . . . προαιρουμένοις μέν τὰ ἀμείνω, δι' ἀσθένειαν δ' ἐσθ' ὅτε ψυχῆς καὶ μαλακίαν παραιτουμένοις (τοῖς . . . παραιτουμένοις deest in K).<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Ed. Kremos, 25.

<sup>20</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 611.

<sup>21</sup> Ed. Kremos, 25.

<sup>22</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 611.

<sup>23</sup> Ed. Kremos, 25.

<sup>24</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, pages 611–12; ed. Lampros (*supra*, note 9), 132 lines 22ff.

Thus the apparent imitation is not slavish, even though the degree of similarity suggests a connection. Some phrases have been altered or used in a slightly different context, and their presentation in the *Vita Niconis* (B) is more complex. Overall, however, the thought and wording of the two introductions are quite similar.

The resemblance between the prologues of these two works is not an isolated phenomenon. Similarities can be found in a number of other areas. In each *Life* the saint's death is described and then followed by a series of posthumous miracles. In both there is a transition passage which indicates the approach the author will follow in narrating these miracles.

### *Vita Lucae*

This transition passage in the earlier *Life* reads:

Ὡρα δὲ καὶ τῶν μετὰ θάνατον τοῦ σοφοῦ  
θαυμάτων μνήμην ποιήσασθαι, οὐ πάντων  
ἀκριβῶς οὐδὲ καθεξῆς, πῶς γὰρ τῶν τοσού-  
των καὶ ἃ νόμασι ποταμίῳ ἐπίσης ῥέουσι  
καὶ μάλισθ' ὅτι μηδὲ μέχρι καὶ νῦν ἐκεῖνα  
τῆς ῥοῆς ἔστησαν; ὀλίγα δὲ τούτων ἀπο-  
λαβόντες εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν ὠφέλειαν  
τῶν εἰς τοῦτο συνειλεγμένων διηγησόμε-  
θα.<sup>25</sup>

### *Vita Niconis*

The corresponding passage in the *Vita Niconis* has:

Ἄλλ' ὥρα (Κ ὅρα) καὶ τῶν μετὰ τὴν κοίμη-  
σιν τοῦ ὁσίου θαυμάτων τε καὶ χαρισμά-  
των, ὧν ἡξιώθη ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ Πνεύματος,  
μνήμην ποιῆσθαι, εἰ καὶ μὴ πάντων ἀκρι-  
βῶς οὐδὲ καθ' ἑξῆς. Πῶς γὰρ, τοσούτων  
ὄντων, ἃ δὴ καὶ ποταμίῳ ἐπίσης ῥέουσι  
νόμασι, καὶ μάλισθ' (Κ μάλιστα) ὅτι μηδὲ  
μέχρι καὶ νῦν ἐκεῖνα τῆς ῥοῆς ἔστησαν;  
Ὅλίγα δὲ τούτων ἀπολαβόντες εἰς δόξαν  
θεοῦ, τοῦ οὕτω δοξάζοντος ὡς ἡ ὑπόσχε-  
σις τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεράποντας, τὰ πλείω τοῖς  
εἰδόσι παραπέμψωμεν.<sup>26</sup>

The similarities here are obvious. Finally, some examples from the epilogues of these two *Lives* will complete our survey of the correspondences between the structural frameworks.

### *Vita Lucae*

The epilogue of Luke's *Life* begins:

Ἀλλὰ πῶς ἂν τις τὰ ἐκείνου λέγων φιλοτι-  
μούμενος μὴ καὶ ἀδυνάτοις ἐπιχειρεῖν δόξειεν  
ὥσπερ ἀστέρων πληθύν ἢ ψάμμον παρά-  
λιον ἢ χώρας θαλαττίους ἐθέλων ἀπαρι-  
σμεῖν...<sup>27</sup>

### *Vita Niconis*

In the epilogue of the *Vita Niconis* we read:

Ῥᾶον γὰρ ἀστέρων πληθύν ἀριθμεῖν καὶ  
ψάμμον παράλιον ἢ καὶ κυάθῳ πέλαγος  
(Κ πέλαγος κοτύλη) ἐκμετρεῖν ἢ καὶ ἄλλο  
τι ἐπιχειρεῖν τῶν ἀνηνύτων (τῶν ἀνηνύτων  
ἐπιχειρεῖν transp. Κ) ἢ τὰ ἐκείνου πάντα  
λέγειν καὶ διηγείσθαι...<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Ed. Kremos, 54.

<sup>26</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 653; ed. Lampros, 184 lines 11 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Ed. Kremos, 61.

<sup>28</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 682; ed. Lampros, 221 lines 4f.

*Vita Lucae*

At another point the epilogue of the *Vita Lucae* has:

Αὐτὸς δέ μοι ἄνωθεν εἴης προστάτης τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ζωῆς, ἱερὲ Λουκᾶ, τὸ ἐμὸν ἐντρύφημα καὶ καλλώπισμα...<sup>29</sup>

The *Vita Nikonis*, then, is articulated by a prologue, a central transitional passage, and an epilogue all of which contain sections bearing a marked resemblance to their counterparts in the *Vita Lucae*. That this relationship also pervades the body of the work can be shown by a number of examples.

*Vita Lucae*

Luke was his parents' third child ...ὃς ἔτι τὴν πρώτην μετιὼν ἡλικίαν καὶ εἰς παῖδας ἐξεταζόμενος οὐδὲν κατὰ παῖδας ἐποίει.<sup>31</sup>

The author of the *Vita Lucae* says of Luke's eating habits:

ὅτι μηδενὶ πρὸς ταῦτα διδασκάλῳ καὶ ὀδηγῷ χρησάμενος, ἀλλ' οἴκοθεν καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς ἅπαν μὲν τὸ τῇ γαστρὶ χαρίζομενον ἐκπολεμῶθεις, πόνους δὲ καὶ ἔνδειαν καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τὸ τὴν σάρκα λυποῦν ἐκ ψυχῆς ἀσπασάμενος.<sup>33</sup>

When Luke is tonsured it is said that the abbot ...τῇ καλλίστῃ χορείᾳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐγκρίναι...<sup>35</sup>

In another passage Luke cures a man near death, μόνῳ δὲ ἄσθματι τὸ νεκρὸν εἶναι μὴ πιστευόμενον.<sup>37</sup>

*Vita Nikonis*

In the same passage Nikon's biographer prays:

Εἴης δέ μοι καὶ προστάτης ἄνωθεν τῆς μονῆς, ἱερὲ Νίκων, τὸ ἐμὸν ἐντρύφημα (Κ τρύφημα) καὶ καλλώπισμα...<sup>30</sup>

*Vita Nikonis*

The young Nikon ...τὴν πρώτην ἐτι μετιὼν ἡλικίαν καὶ εἰς παῖδας ἐξεταζόμενος (Β ἐξεταζόμενος; Κ ἐξισαζόμενος) οὐ κατὰ παῖδας εἶχε τὸ φρόνημα...<sup>32</sup>

Nikon's biographer says:

Λίαν γὰρ ἐκπολεμηθεὶς πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ τῇ γαστρὶ χαρίζομενον, πόνους διηνεκεῖς καὶ ἔνδειαν καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον τῶν τὴν σάρκα λυπεῖν εἰδόντων ἐκθύμως ἠσπάζετο. And below that ...μηδενὶ πρὸς ταῦτα παιδευτῇ καὶ ὀδηγῷ χρησάμενος, οἴκοθεν καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ Nikon began his ascetic contests.<sup>34</sup>

In the *Vita Nikonis* one reads that the abbot ...τῇ καλλίστῃ χορείᾳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐγκρίνει (Κ τῇ καλλίστῃ χορηγίᾳ ἐγκρίνει).<sup>36</sup>

In the *Vita Nikonis* the saint comes to the home of John Blabenterios in Argos and finds the man and his daughter τῷ ἄσθματι δὲ μόνον νεκροῦς εἶναι μὴ πιστευομένους.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Ed. Kremos, 62.

<sup>30</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 683; ed. Lampros, 221 lines 23ff.

<sup>31</sup> Ed. Kremos, 27.

<sup>32</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 612; ed. Lampros, 133 lines 24f.

<sup>33</sup> Ed. Kremos, 27.

<sup>34</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 615; ed. Lampros, 137 lines 14ff.

<sup>35</sup> Ed. Kremos, 29.

<sup>36</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 615; ed. Lampros, 136 line 27.

<sup>37</sup> Ed. Kremos, 44.

<sup>38</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 634; ed. Lampros, 160 line 28.

*Vita Lucae*

We are told of Luke's sleeping habits: Εἶτα μικρόν τι τοῦ ὕπνου παραγευόμενος, εὐθὺς ἀνεπήδα καὶ τῷ Δαβίδ συνεφθέγγετο, "Προέφθασα ἐν ἁωρίᾳ καὶ ἐκέκραξα". καὶ αὐθις, "Προέφθασαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου πρὸς ὄρθρον τοῦ μελετᾶν τὰ λόγια σου."<sup>39</sup>

When Luke wished to live apart from the monastery as an anchorite, the abbot . . . καὶ οὐκ ἠνείχετο τὴν διάλευξιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ δριμεῖς τῶν κατὰ Θεὸν φιλοῦντων οἱ πόθοι καὶ τῶν φυσικῶν ἰσχυρότεροι.<sup>41</sup>

Luke's biographer explains the saint's decision to go to Kalamion as follows:

Τούτων ὁ θαυμάσιος ἀκούσας Λουκάς τῶν τοῦ Ἰωαννίτζη μερῶν ἀφίσταται καὶ πρὸς τι χωρίον Καλάμιον οὕτως ἐπιχωρίως καλούμενον μεταβαίνει, ὃ μὴ μόνον εὖ ἔχον ἡσυχίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄερος ἐν καλῷ κείμενον σφόδρα ἐκείνος ἡσπάσατο ἐν αὐτῷ τε διὰ γων ἡγάλλετο τὴν ψυχὴν.<sup>43</sup>

In the *Vita Lucae* one posthumous miracle ends with the cured man's return home . . . Τελείας οὖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐπιτυχῶν τῆς ἐλευθερίας οἶκαδε ἐπανήει, χαίροντας ἰδὼν τοὺς οἰκείους χαίρουσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς, while in another the person healed ἐγερθεὶς τοῦ ὕπνου καὶ τὸ ὄναρ μὴ ἀγνοήσας φανεράν ὑπάρχειν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσι τε διηγείτο καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ πάντας εἶχε Θεὸν καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ θεράποντα μεγαλύνοντας.<sup>45</sup>

*Vita Niconis*

Nikon's biographer tells us that he rivaled Arsenios in going without sleep and that . . . διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς φύσεως μικρόν τοῦ ὕπνου καὶ ἀδρανὲς καὶ οἶον (Κ οἶονεῖ) διεψευσμένον (Κ διαψευσάμενον) παραγεύεσθαι, εὐθὺς ἀνεπήδα, τὰ τοῦ Δαβίδ ᾄδων καὶ λέγων "Προέφθασα ἐν ἁωρίᾳ καὶ ἐκέκραξα," καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.<sup>40</sup>

When Nikon learned that his father was looking for him, he told the abbot that he must flee, but τὴν διάλευξιν οὐκ ἠνείχετο.

And both he and the abbot wept; λίαν γὰρ δριμεῖς τῶν κατὰ Θεὸν φιλοῦντων οἱ πόθοι καὶ τῶν φυσικῶν ἰσχυρότεροι.<sup>42</sup>

When the abbot becomes concerned lest Nikon's austere life-style endanger his health he . . . οἰκίσκον δὲ αὐτῷ προσαποτάξας πρὸς ἡσυχίαν εὖ ἔχοντα . . . (Κ οἰκίσκον δὲ τινα πρὸς ἡσυχίαν εὖ ἔχοντα δειμᾶμενος . . .). And Nikon agreed to live there: ἦν γὰρ ἐν καλῷ (Κ ἐν λάκκῳ) κείμενον ἡσυχίας τὸ δωμάτιον . . .<sup>44</sup>

In the *Vita Niconis* one posthumous miracle narrates the cure of a child and ends . . . ὁ πατὴρ χαίρουσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς χαίροντας ἑώρα τοὺς οἰκείους, καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ πάντας εἶχε Θεὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ θεράποντα μεγαλύνοντας (Κ ὁ πατὴρ χαίνουσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἑώρα τοὺς οἰκείους· καὶ ἀπελθὼν οἶκαδε χαίρων, ὀλοψύχως Θεὸν ἐδόξαζε καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ θεράποντα ἐμεγάλυνεν).<sup>46</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Ed. Kremos, 35.

<sup>40</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 616; ed. Lampros, 138 lines 3ff.

<sup>41</sup> Ed. Kremos, 32.

<sup>42</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 619; ed. Lampros, 142 lines 26ff.

<sup>43</sup> Ed. Kremos, 45.

<sup>44</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 617; ed. Lampros, 139 lines 9f. and 17f.

<sup>45</sup> Ed. Kremos, 57 and 60.

<sup>46</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 674; ed. Lampros, 205 lines 24ff.



*Vita Lucae*

In the *Vita Lucae* Pothos, the *strategos* of Hellas, desires to return to Constantinople to be with his wife after the death of their son. Yet, because of the dangerous atmosphere in the imperial court, he is afraid. He consults Luke, who tells him to go without fear that the emperor will be favorable to him. His reaction is described in the following words: Ταῦτα ὁ στρατηγὸς ὡς ἐκ προφητικῆς καὶ θεοπνεύστου γλώττης ἀκούσας καὶ μηδὲν ἐφ' οἷς ἀκήκοεν ὅλως ἐπιδοιάσας, ὁδοῦ εἶχετο.<sup>47</sup>

In the *Vita Lucae* one of the posthumous miracles concerns a certain John of Terbenia. Being too ill to ride, he is unable to come to the saint's shrine to seek a cure. Instead he takes a different approach:

φθάνει τὸν τόπον τῇ διανοίᾳ, τοῖς τῆς πίστεως διαθήει πτεροῖς· αὐτῆς ψαύει τῆς σοροῦ τοῖς χεῖλεσι· καλεῖ, καὶ σώματι μακρὰν ὦν, τὸν ἐγγὺς παρῆναι μὴ ἀποροῦντα διὰ τῆς χάριτος...<sup>48</sup>

Finally, Luke's biographer reports, among that saint's posthumous miracles, the cure of a blind man. The story is worth quoting in full:

Ὁ τοῦ μέλλοντος ῥηθήσεσθαι θαύματος ἀπολαύσας οὔτε τὴν πόλιν ὅθεν ἐστὶν οὔτε τὸ ὄνομα ὃ κέκλητο δῆλος ἡμῖν καθίσταται ἢ ὅτι τὰς τῶν ὁμμάτων εἶχε βολὰς ἀμαυράς, τοὺς τοῦ σώματος ἀμφοτέρους ἀπέσβετο λύχνους, τοῦ γλυκυτάτου πᾶσιν ἐστέρειτο φωτός. Οὗτος ἀπάσης τῆς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπογνοῦς βοηθείας, ὡς κρεῖττον ὢν τὸ πάθος ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρωπίνην καὶ τέχνην καὶ

*Vita Nikonis*

In a similar scene in the *Vita Nikonis* John Malakenos, a wealthy Laconian, is falsely accused of treason and summoned to appear before the emperor. He consults Nikon who tells him to go without fear since the emperor will recognize his innocence and honor him with a position in the senate. His reaction is described as follows: Ὁ τοίνυν Μαλακηνός, ὡς ἐκ προφητικῆς γλώσσης καὶ θεοπνεύστου ταῦτα ἀκηκόως καὶ μηδὲν ὅλως τούτοις ἐπιδοιάσας, παρεκλήθη οὔτι μετρίως.<sup>48</sup>

In the *Vita Nikonis* a certain young novice named Luke is in a similar situation. His solution is like that of John of Terbenia:

Φθάνει τῇ διανοίᾳ τὸν θεῖον καὶ ἱερὸν οἶκον τοῦ μάκαρος ... καὶ τοῖς τῆς πίστεως πτέροις, αὐτῆς (Κ αὐτοῖς) ψαύει τῆς σοροῦ τοῖς χεῖλεσι, καὶ καλεῖ (καλεῖ om. Κ) σώματι πόρρω διεστηκώς, τὸν ἐγγὺς παρῆναι μὴ ἀποροῦντα (ἤλπισε add. Κ) διὰ τῆς χάριτος.<sup>50</sup>

In the *Vita Nikonis* a certain monk, Procopius, is cured of blindness. Here, too, a lengthy citation is in order:

Ἀλλὰ προσεκτέον. Ὁφθήσεται γὰρ καὶ τὸ μέλλον ῥηθῆναι διὰ βραχέων καινὸν καὶ παράδοξον καὶ διηγήσεως ἄξιον. Ἀνὴρ γάρ τις τῶν ἔτι (Κ ἐν) τῷ βίῳ περιόντων καὶ τῷ πολλάκις δηλωθέντι μετοχίῳ τῆς μονῆς (Κ add. τοῦ μάκαρος) τὰς οἰκίσεις ποιούμενος, ὑγρότητος δριμυτάτης ἐπιρροῇ (Κ ἐπιρροῆς) ποτε λώβην τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ὑποστάς οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν καὶ ὑπόχυσιν (Κ

<sup>47</sup> Ed. Kremos, 49.

<sup>48</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 649; ed. Lampros, 178 lines 24 ff.

<sup>49</sup> Ed. Kremos, 58.

<sup>50</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 669; ed. Lampros, 209 lines 8 ff.

*Vita Lucae*

θεραπείαν, ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον καταφεύγει καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ ναὸν εἰσελθὼν χεῖράς τε ἅμα καὶ τὰ τῆς διανοίας ὑψώσας ὁμματα, “Λῦσόν μου τὸ σκότος ὁ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ φωτός, ἔλεγε, παραστάτης καὶ κληρονόμος· ἀπάλλαξόν με τῆς κατεχούσης νυκτός· ἴδω σου τὴν εἰκόνα· προσβλέψω τὴν θῆκην· τὸ σεμνεῖον θεάσωμαι· τοῦ τεμένου κατατρυφήσω· κηρύξω πᾶσι καὶ διηγῆσωμαι τὰ θαυμασιά σου, πλησθέντος μοι χαρᾶς τοῦ στόματος καὶ τῆς γλώττης ἀγαλλιάσεως.” Οὕτως ἐκεῖνος δεόμενος, ἐπεὶπερ ὁ ἅγιος τὴν ἴασιν ἀνεβάλλετο, ῥαθυμίας ἡττηθεὶς οἶκαδε ἀνεχώρει, δευτέραν θέμενος μικροψύχου θελήματος τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς θεραπείας· πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως οὐχ ὑπερεῖδεν αὐτὸν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος καὶ περὶ τὸ συμπαθεῖν ἐτοιμότατος, ἀλλ’ ὀδεύοντι καὶ ἔτι ὁδοῦ ἐχομένῳ τὰ τῆς εὐχῆς ἐκπληροῖ καὶ τὸ λίαν διψώμενον χαρίζεται φῶς· οὐ μὴν ἀθρόαν οὐδὲ παραχρῆμα τὴν ὅλην αὐγὴν δίδωσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μικρὸν ὑφαπλουμένην αὐτῷ καὶ τρανουμένην τῇ τοῦ λυπηροῦ σκότους ὑποχωρήσει. Ἀμέλει καὶ δυσπιστεῖν εἶχε τὸ πρῶτον καὶ οὐκ ἀληθὲς τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐνόμιζεν· ἐπεὶ δὲ σαφεῖς ἐδέχετο τὰς τῶν ὁρατῶν ἀντιλήψεις καὶ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως ἑώρα τοῖς καλῶς βλέπουσι, χαρᾶς πλησθεὶς μετὰ θαύματος τῷ θείῳ Λουκᾷ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς πᾶσι τὸ θαῦμα δίδωσι, τρανωθεὶς μετὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν τῇ περιουσίᾳ τῆς ἡδονῆς.<sup>51</sup>

*Vita Niconis*

λῶβην ὑποστὰς κατὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, τοῦ βλέπειν ἐστέρητο, καὶ) ἄμαυράς εἶχε (K ἔχων) τὰς τῶν ὀμμάτων βολάς, καὶ (K om. καὶ) τοὺς λύχνους τοῦ σώματος ἀθλίως οὕτω (K add. σκότους) πεπλήρωτο (K πεπλήρωτο) καὶ τοῦ πᾶσιν ἡδυτάτου φωτός παντάπασιν ἀπεστέρητο. Comparison is made to a New Testament miracle and then, the ailment being incurable, we are told that the man . . . τῶν ἄλλων πάντων καὶ οὗτος ὑπεριδὼν καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπογνοῦς θεραπείας, πρὸς τὸν κοινὸν καὶ ἁμισθον ἱατρὸν ἔγνω δεῖν καταφεύγειν. Καὶ δῆτα καὶ (K om. καὶ) ἀνακλίνας (K κατακλίνας) ἑαυτὸν εἴσω τοῦ ἐν τῷ μετοχίῳ, ἰδρυμένου ἐπ’ ὀνόματι τοῦ ὁσίου, ἱεροῦ εὐκτηρίου, ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ἐκεῖσε θείας καὶ θαυματουργοῦ εἰκόνος τοῦ μάκαρος χεῖρας τε ἅμα καὶ ὁμματα τῆς διανοίας ὑψώσας, Λῦσόν μου, ἔλεγε, τὸ σκότος ὁ τοῦ (K om. τοῦ) πρώτου καὶ ἀληθινοῦ φωτός κληρονόμος· λύτρωσόν (K λύτρωσαί) με τοῦ πιέζοντος πάθους· ἀπάλλαξόν με τῆς κατεχούσης νυκτός· ἴδω σου τὴν σεβάσμιον εἰκόνα· κατατρυφήσω τοῦ θείου τεμένου· κηρύξω πᾶσι καὶ διηγῆσομαι σου τὰ θαυμάσια. Οὕτως οὖν τῷ Προκοπίῳ. Nikon appears to Procopius in a dream and cures him. When the monk awakens, he . . . τὸ λίαν διψώμενον φῶς καὶ τὴν ὅλην αὐγὴν παραχρῆμα (K παρὰ χρῆμα) ἀπελάμβανε, καὶ καθαρῶς ἑώρα πᾶσιν ὁμοίως τοῖς καλῶς βλέπουσιν. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ παραδόξῳ τούτῳ θαύματι χαρᾶς πλησθεὶς καὶ θυμηδίας, δόξῃ τῇ πρὸς θεὸν ἐχρήτο καὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον εὐχαριστίᾳ, τρανωθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν, καὶ κῆρυξ ὢν διαπρύσιος (K κηρύττων διαπρυσίως) μέχρι καὶ τήμερον τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν γενομένης παραδοξοποιίας (K add. οὐ παύεται).<sup>52</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Ed. Kremos, 58.<sup>52</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 670; ed. Lampros, 210 lines 14 ff.

A number of other comparisons might be made,<sup>53</sup> but the examples given are sufficient to show the relationship between the *Vita Nikonis* (B) and the *Vita Lucae*. The anonymous author of Nikon's biography appears to have used portions of the earlier work as a model, both for the basic structure of his own composition and for the details of some individual incidents. Admittedly, Byzantine hagiographic texts are highly traditional in format and phraseology. The possibility, however, that the similarities cited above result from independent use of common ideas and phrases is quite remote. The similar structural passages and direct quotations make this clear. Moreover, a perusal of the two models of Byzantine hagiography, Athanasius' *Vita Antonii* and Gregory Nazianzenus' *In Laudem Basilii Magni*, as well as a variety of other *Lives*, especially those of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries,<sup>54</sup> reveals none which contain such precise and numerous similarities. Similar ideas do occur, e.g., in the descriptions of a saint's childhood, but not to the extent detailed above.

The Barberini version of the *Vita Nikonis*, then, seems in part to have been written using the *Vita Lucae* as a model. This method of composition is interesting in itself. The author, who was abbot of Nikon's monastery in Sparta, must have worked directly from a copy of the *Vita* of St. Luke of Phocis. But more significant still is the light this discovery throws on the relationship between the B and K versions. To this point I have compared only the Barberini version to the *Vita Lucae*. A brief survey of these same passages in K is instructive for the question of the priority of the versions.<sup>55</sup> First, the Koutloumoussi text contains many of the same quotations from the *Vita Lucae* as B. The whole transitional passage, portions of the epilogue, and a number of narrative passages are virtually the same as those in B.

<sup>53</sup> In the *Vita Lucae* (ed. Kremos, 34), Luke's assumption of the μέγα σχῆμα has a number of verbal similarities to the comparable scene in the *Vita Nikonis* (MS Barberini gr. 583, page 635). Luke's years of service to a stylite near Corinth (ed. Kremos, 39) are described in terms that closely resemble Nikon's service in the monastery of Chryse Petra (MS Barberini gr. 583, page 615). It is notable in this passage that, while both the *Vita Lucae* and B contain the phrase . . . ταύτην ταπείνωσιν . . . ἡλῶν, K has . . . ταύτην ταπείνωσιν . . . μιμούμενος (ed. Lampros, 137 lines 3–4). Later Luke (ed. Kremos, 39) is the object of abusive treatment in a scene that resembles the story of Nikon and John Aratos (MS Barberini gr. 583, pages 639–40). Here, too, there are a number of similar phrases, and the turning point of both scenes comes with a quote from Psalm 75:8, ὁ Θεὸς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἠκούτιζε κρίσιν. Finally, Crinites, who held the ἀρχή of Hellas (ed. Kremos, 49), is drawn to consult Luke just as Basil Apocau-cos, the praetor at Corinth, is drawn to seek Nikon's aid (MS Barberini gr. 583, page 645).

<sup>54</sup> I have looked for similarities in the *Lives* of Daniel the Stylite (d. 493), Theodore of Sykeon (d. 613), John the Almsgiver (d. 620), Athanasius of Methone (ninth cent.), Theocletus (d. ca. 870), Peter of Argos (d. ca. 922), Michael Maleinos (d. 961), Nilus of Grottaferrata (d. 1004), Athanasius the Athonite (d. ca. 1004), Symeon the New Theologian (d. 1022), Meletios (d. 1105), and Cyrill of Philea (d. 1110). In none have I discovered anything approaching the degree of similarity found in the two *Lives* compared above. In fact, only in the *Life* of Athanasius the Athonite have I found even a few similar phrases, and these were not the kind of precise quotations seen in the *Vita Nikonis*. I might also note that N. Veas, Συμβολή εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν μονῶν τῶν Μετεώρων, *Byzantis*, 1 (1909), 220–21, found a close resemblance between the prologue of the *Life* of Athanasius of the Meteora (d. 1383) and that of the *Vita Lucae*. This *vita* was of course written long after that of Nikon and its dependence on the *Vita Lucae* does not affect the argument presented above. Rather, its anonymous author seems to have used the *Vita Lucae* just as the author of Nikon's biography did, but less extensively.

<sup>55</sup> See *supra*, pp. 162–67.

This suggests that the borrowings from the *Vita Lucae* must have been present in the original version of the *Vita Niconis*. On the other hand, K is also missing a number of such borrowings which B preserves. Portions of the prologue in B which closely resemble the prologue of the *Vita Lucae* are not present in K, which has a completely different introductory passage. Then in the description of Nikon's childhood K has the reading *ἐξισαζόμενος*, while both B and the *Vita Lucae* have *ἐξεταζόμενος* (to be counted in the number of<sup>56</sup>). In the tonsure scene K reads *τῇ καλλίστῃ χορηγίᾳ ἐγκρίνει* . . . , again at odds with both B and the *Vita Lucae* which have *τῇ καλλίστῃ χορείᾳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐγκρίνει*. In the description of the *δωμάτιον* K has *ἐν λάκκῳ*, at variance with the *ἐν καλῷ* of both B and the *Vita Lucae* and the sense of the passage. The *δωμάτιον* is "well situated for hesychia" and not "situated in a ditch." In the passage concerning the cure of the child B and K differ substantially. B's ending for the miracle appears to bring together almost verbatim the endings of two miracles in the *Vita Lucae*. This correspondence is lost in K where the passage seems to have been deliberately rewritten. Finally, the story of the young novice Luke shows B and the *Vita Lucae* agreeing with the reading *καλεῖ*, while K has the clearly intentional change to *ἤλπισε*.

These variants in K show that, while both versions contain borrowings from the *Vita Lucae*, K preserves them less faithfully and less fully than B. In perhaps two instances the differences might be attributed to transmission problems, but in most cases they are clearly the result of deliberate alterations. And whenever B and K differ in these borrowings, B is always closer to the *Vita Lucae*. I conclude that the Barberini version is the original and the Koutloumoussi a revision. The borrowings from the *Vita Lucae* were the work of the original author, essential parts of the composition. Some of these borrowings were lost when the revision preserved in K was written. The reviser responsible for the Koutloumoussi version may not have been aware of the model on which the original was based. At any rate, he altered it in ways which took it away from this model.

Before concluding this section, I would like to consider one other difference between B and K which reinforces my contention that the Barberini version is the original one. In the Koutloumoussi version the description of Nikon's birth begins with the following passage:

Τούτῳ τοίνυν τῷ μακαρίῳ πατρί μεν ἡ πρώτη καὶ θειότερα καί, ὥσπερ εἶπεν οἰκειότερον, ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐν ἣ, κατὰ τὸν θεῖον φάναι Δαβίδ, διεπλάσθη, πρὸς ἣν καὶ ἀπετίθετο διηνεκῶς τὸ πολίτευμα, καὶ πρὸς ἣν αἰεὶ ἔσπευδεν ἀναβὰς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὅσαι ὥραι τιθέμενος καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἀνάγων πρὸς θεωρίαν τῆς ἡλιακῆς ἀψίδος ὑπεριπτάμενον.<sup>57</sup>

The Barberini version here reads . . . αἰεὶ ἔσπευδε ἀναβάσεις ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὅσαι ὥραι τιθέμενος καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἀνάγων πρὸς θεωρίαν τῆς ὑλικῆς δυάδος ὑπεριπτάμενον<sup>58</sup>. The noun *ἀναβάσεις* is preferable to the participle *ἀναβάς*. The later participle *τιθέμενος* requires an object, and it seems best to read "making ascents hourly

<sup>56</sup> See H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1940), 592.

<sup>57</sup> Ed. Lampros (*supra*, note 9), 133 lines 8-13.

<sup>58</sup> MS Barberini gr. 583, page 612.

in his heart." The second difference between B and K is more significant. Either the saint's mind is "flying beyond the sunny arch," or "flying beyond the material duality." Again recourse to external evidence seems to provide an answer. In section two of Oration 21 (*In Laudem Athanasii*),<sup>59</sup> Gregory Nazianzenus says: μακάριος οὗτος, τῆς τε ἐντεῦθεν ἀναβάσεως, καὶ τῆς ἐκεῖσε θεώσεως, ἣν τὸ γνησίως φιλοσοφῆσαι χαρίζεται, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τὴν ὕλικὴν δυάδα γενέσθαι. Earlier in the same passage he states that such a man achieves union with God διὰ λόγου καὶ θεωρίας.<sup>60</sup> The number of verbal similarities between this passage in Gregory and that in the *Vita Nikonis* (μακάριος, ἀναβάσεις, θεωρία, and ὑπὲρ τῆς ὕλικῆς δυάδος), as well as the general similarity of thought, suggests that the author of the *Vita Nikonis* was aware of Gregory's definition of μακάριος and incorporated it into his description of Nikon. The reference to ἡ ὕλικὴ δυάς, preserved only in B, is an essential part of this definition.<sup>61</sup> The fact that both B and K preserve the other similarities while only B preserves this phrase is indicative. It must have been part of the original version and been corrupted in K. The change to τῆς ἡλιακῆς ἀψίδος might be explained on paleographical grounds, but given what we have already seen of K's relationship to the *Vita Lucae*, it is perhaps more likely that the reviser was unaware of the origin of the phrase and altered it to something more readily understandable to him. In either case, B is again seen to preserve a correct reading in a passage derived from an earlier piece of hagiography.

#### IV. INTERNAL EVIDENCE

In the preceding section I have argued for the priority of the version of the *Vita Nikonis* contained in the Barberini manuscript by reference to external evidence. I would like now to compare the sequences of posthumous miracles found in B and K. I believe that certain significant differences between the two reveal, solely on the basis of internal evidence, that the sequence found in the Barberini version is the earlier and correct one.

One of the major differences between B and K lies in the order of presentation of the miracles which occurred after Nikon's death. Each version reports twenty-six of these, introduced by the transition passage drawn from the *Vita Lucae*. To facilitate the argument which follows, I list the miracles, identified where possible by the name or residence of the person cured, together with any specific chronological indications. The order given is that of the Barberini version.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>59</sup> PG, 35, cols. 1081–1128.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, col. 1084C.

<sup>61</sup> I also find the phrase in the *Life* of Athanasius the Athonite; cf. I. Pomialovskij, *Žitie Prepodobnago Afanasija Afonskago* (St. Petersburg, 1895), 15 lines 4–5. It is said that Athanasius traveled to Athos with no material possessions and without fear of robbers, τῷ ὑπὲρ τὴν ὕλικὴν ἤδη δυάδα γενέσθαι. Thus the phrase must have had some currency in the eleventh-twelfth century. In the *Life* of Athanasius, however, the context does not suggest a direct knowledge of the passage in Gregory Nazianzenus, as is the case in the *Vita Nikonis* (B).

<sup>62</sup> The posthumous miracles in B are found on pages 653–83.

1. John, son of Sabbatius (at Nikon's funeral)
2. Basil Apocaukos (. . . τὴν τοῦ πραίτωρος ἀρχὴν διοικήσας)
3. Man from Elos
4. Man from Plagia, near Corinth
5. Woman from Sparta
6. Autochthonous woman
7. Second man from Elos
8. Monk from Kalamata
9. Cataclysm at Kalamata (during Nikon's lifetime)
10. The Abbot Gregorius and the *kubikularios*
11. Antiochus, dux of the Ethnikoi
12. Michael Choirosphaktes
13. Milengoi
14. The novice Luke (ὃς καὶ μέχρι τῆς δεῦρο ἰῶν)
15. Procopius (τῶν ἔτι τῷ βίῳ περιόντων)
16. Michael Argyrometes (ὃς ἔτι ἐν τοῖς ἰῶσιν ἔστι)
17. Image of Nikon on the πλαῖξ λιθίνη
18. Stephan (ἰῶν γὰρ ἔτι καὶ οὗτος καὶ περιών)
19. Gregorius, son of Stephan (ὀλίγαις ὕστερον ἡμέραις)
20. Manuel (in the same year the author became abbot)
21. Author himself cured
22. Girl kidnapped from *metochion*
23. John (ὁ πρὸ μικροῦ γεγένηται)
24. Aquilaeen traders (ἄρτι . . . ἐγχωριάσαντες)
25. Young boy in the monastery (τὴν πρὸ βραχέος τελεσθεῖσαν)
26. General statement on Nikon's aid to Lacedaemonians, especially sailors.

The presentation of these miracles in K contains some major differences.<sup>63</sup> The stories of the novice Luke, Procopius, and Michael Argyrometes (B, nos. 14, 15, and 16) are placed as a group later in the sequence, following the author's own cure (B, no. 21), so that in K they become nos. 19, 20, and 21, with nos. 17–21 moving up to become nos. 14–18 in K. This arrangement also involves substantial differences in the introductions to the stories of Luke and the πλαῖξ λιθίνη. In B this Luke is said to be a novice in a monastery of St. Nicholas near Sparta, while the πλαῖξ λιθίνη is said to be situated in the church built by Nikon at Sparta. In K the novice Luke is placed in the shrine of a *metochion* of Nikon's monastery, while the πλαῖξ λιθίνη is in the monastery of St. Nicholas. Thus, in addition to the difference in the sequence of the miracles, there is also a factual discrepancy between the two versions. Two factors, I believe, indicate that this error lies in K.

First, the twenty-six miracles seem to follow a rudimentary chronological order. Although the author states in the transition passage that he will not

<sup>63</sup> See ed. Lampros (*supra*, note 9), 184 line 11–220 line 33.

narrate them καὶ ἐξῆς, this phrase has been appropriated from the *Vita Lucae* and is quickly disregarded. In fact, after the digression on the cataclysm at Kalamata (B, no. 9), which is prompted by the preceding story of a monk from Kalamata, the author returns to his narrative with the words: ὁ δὲ λόγος καὶ εἰρὸν καὶ αὖθις ὁδεύετω, τέρπων ἀκοᾶς φιλοθέους ἐπὶ τῇ καὶ ἐξῆς διηγήσει τῶν τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἐκάστην θαυματουργουμένων.<sup>64</sup> Thus, he openly admits the digression and states in his own words his desire to proceed "in order." It is also notable that the list of miracles given above seems to divide chronologically into two groups of thirteen. In the second group (B, nos. 14–26) ten of the stories are definitely contemporary with the author, as the references show. The remaining three stories in this group (B, nos. 17, 22, and 26) contain less specific indications that they too are contemporary. Moreover, within this second group there appears to be an internal chronological order. B begins in sequence with the stories of men who are said to be "alive *even* to this day," or to be "*still* alive," mentions an experience of the author himself and ends with a group of events described progressively as πρὸ μικροῦ, ἄρτι, and πρὸ βραχείας. The first thirteen miracles, on the other hand, contain no such references and are clearly earlier. The first two, in fact, may be placed at or shortly after Nikon's funeral, while the Abbot Gregorius (B, no. 10) is definitely a predecessor of the author.

Given this apparent chronological order, we may ask which sequence, that of B or K, is more logical. The final thirteen in B begin with the miracle of the novice Luke, "who is alive even to this day." This Luke was a νεανίας<sup>65</sup> when his miracle took place, but the author knows him as a man with gray hair (τῆς ἡδὴ ἐπανθούσης αὐτοῦ πολιᾶς<sup>66</sup>). A considerable span of time separates the occurrence of the miracle from the date at which the author is writing, a fact which he stresses by describing Luke as καὶ μέχρι τῆς δεῦρο ὧν. In K, which contains the same chronological references to this novice Luke, the miracle appears nineteenth in sequence, instead of fourteenth, and comes after the story of the author's own cure. It is arguable, I believe, that the sequence in B is the more logical chronologically. The miracle experienced by Luke as a νεανίας should be the earliest of those associated with contemporaries of the author. In B it occupies this position, although in K it follows the story of the author's own cure, a position which seems to violate the chronological relationship between the two men as well as that of the whole sequence of posthumous miracles.

One other factor also supports the correctness of the sequence in B. In miracle no. 18 in B a certain Stephan is described as ὧν γὰρ ἔτι καὶ οὗτος καὶ περιῶν,<sup>67</sup> a phrase which appears in the text of K also. The first καὶ here is used to limit οὗτος, so that the phrase may be rendered "for this one *too* is still alive and surviving." In this context the καὶ suggests that there has

<sup>64</sup> MS Barberini gr., page 659; ed. Lampros, 191 lines 17ff.

<sup>65</sup> Ed. Lampros, 208 line 13; MS Barberini gr. 583, page 668.

<sup>66</sup> Ed. Lampros, 208 line 16; MS Barberini gr. 583, page 668.

<sup>67</sup> Ed. Lampros, 203 line 23; MS Barberini gr. 583, page 672.

already been at least one previous reference to a living contemporary of the author in the sequence of posthumous miracles. If we accept the sequence of B, this condition is met, since the novice Luke is said to be ζῶν and Procopius and Michael Argyrometes are also characterized as being still alive. In K, however, the story of Stephan precedes these three miracles, and the καὶ has no point of reference. Again, therefore, internal evidence suggests that the sequence of the Barberini version is the correct one.

#### V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing argument might be summarized as follows. The texts of the *Vita Niconis* contained in MSS Barberini gr. 583 and Koutloumoussi 210 are different versions of the *Life*, one a rewriting of the other. Evidence presented here indicates that the original version is that contained in B; this judgment is based primarily on external evidence derived from the *Vita Lucae Junioris*. I have suggested that the original author of the *Vita Niconis* was well acquainted with the *Vita* of Luke of Phocis and incorporated portions of it into his own work. I have then shown that the relationship of the *Vita Niconis* to the *Vita Lucae*, although found in both the Barberini and Koutloumoussi versions, is more fully and precisely preserved in B. This has led to the conclusion that B contains the original version and that K is a revision by someone who was probably unaware of the intentional borrowings from the *Vita Lucae* and who made changes which diminished and obscured the relationship. This conclusion is further strengthened by a comparison of the differing sequences of posthumous miracles found in B and K. Analysis of the order of these miracles reveals that only B's sequence is chronologically consistent.

The Barberini version, therefore, is the original. As I indicated at the outset, this paper originated from research undertaken to evaluate the need for a new critical edition of the *Vita Niconis*. It is now clear that such an edition is necessary. That of Lampros, based solely on K, has only limited value. Obviously the heretofore unedited Barberini manuscript must serve as the basis of such an edition. K may provide some valuable readings, but wherever there is evidence of revision, the text of B will be closer to what the original author wrote.<sup>68</sup>

University of Maryland

<sup>68</sup> In the process of preparing this paper I have profited much from the suggestions and criticism of Professor Nicolas Oikonomides of the University of Montreal and of Dr. John W. Nesbitt of Dartmouth.